



Hood Canal Coordinating Council Final Report

*Washington State Department of Ecology
Watershed Protection and Restoration Grant*



*Prepared by:
Betsy Daniels,
Triangle Associates, Inc.
for
The Hood Canal Coordinating Council*

*Submitted
September 29, 2008*

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Section I: Conducting Background Research and Help to Design a Project Approach	2
Section II: Assessment of Planning Groups in Hood Canal	4
Section III: Contractor Conducted Preparations for Working Group Meeting.....	6
Section IV: Contractor Facilitated a Watershed Integration Meeting	7
Section V: HCCC Revised the Expected Deliverables Associated with the Project.....	10
Section VI: HCCC Reviewed and Considered its Mission	11
Section VII: HCCC Outreach to Planning Groups in Hood Canal.....	11
Conclusions	12
For More Information.....	12

Attachments:

HCCC Watershed Integration Interview Guide.....	1
Hood Canal Watershed Integration Contact Record.....	2
Final Assessment.....	3
Hood Canal Watershed Integration Meeting Summary	4

Watershed Protection and Restoration Grant Final Report



Introduction

The Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) received a Puget Sound Watershed Protection and Restoration grant from the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) in January 2007. This grant was offered to each of the 14 watersheds in Puget Sound in an effort to “integrate actions associated with water quality, water quantity, habitat protection, and habitat restoration in the Puget Sound basin.”¹

The original scope of work submitted by HCCC to Ecology in early 2007 outlined an approach for the HCCC staff to use the grant to develop a report that reviewed existing plans recommended an integrated approach to planning and implementation in Hood Canal. When it came time to launch this initial effort, the HCCC Executive Director decided that a neutral third-party contractor would be better suited to provide a neutral interface with the planning groups and give the HCCC the opportunity to serve in a convening role.

In September 2007, HCCC contracted with Triangle Associates, Inc. to provide process design, project management and facilitation services for the Watershed Protection and Restoration grant objectives. The objective of the Hood Canal effort was to bring together representatives from habitat, water quantity and water quality planning groups within the watershed to explore a collaborative process for integrating their efforts to implement actions across the watershed. The HCCC chose the geographic focus of Hood Canal watershed to include Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 16 and 17. This effort resulted in seven part exploration of how the planning efforts in Hood Canal can work together to inform the development and implementation of the Hood Canal portion of the Puget Sound Partnership’s (Partnership) Action Agenda. These seven phases included:

¹ ECY Form #070-239 (revised 10/30/06). 2007 Puget Sound Watershed Protection & Restoration Grant Application.

HCCC contracting with Triangle Associates to:

- I. Conduct background research and help to design a project approach
- II. Assess the interests of planning groups in Hood Canal
- III. Prepare an effective agenda, invitees and materials for a working group meeting
- IV. Facilitate a watershed integration meeting

As a result of these activities the HCCC:

- V. Revised the expected deliverables associated with the project
- VI. Reviewed and considered its mission
- VII. Conducted outreach to Planning Groups in Hood Canal about achieving the integration of habitat and water activities through the HCCC

This final report includes a summary of activities associated with each of the project's resulting seven steps, as well as conclusions on outcomes produced from the foundational work conducted under this grant.

I. Conducting Background Research and Help to Design a Project Approach

In the fall of 2007, Triangle worked with the HCCC Executive Director to design a revised approach and work plan for the 2007 Watershed Protection and Restoration Grant funding. During this phase Triangle:

- Met with HCCC staff to develop a draft project approach that would take into account the large number of efforts underway in Hood Canal and allowed for substantive dialogue.
- Reviewed existing planning reports to prepare for interviewing representatives of the planning efforts from throughout Hood Canal.
- Individually interviewed Ann Butler, the Ecology grant manager, Phil Wiatrek as the WRIA 16 and 17 Ecology representative, and John Cambalik the Puget Sound Partnership Regional Liaison at the time for Hood Canal.

Through this background research, Triangle learned that the original intent of the EPA funding was to integrate salmon recovery and watershed planning efforts within watersheds. With the creation of the Puget Sound Partnership, how each watershed may organize to contribute to and later implement the Partnership's Action Agenda became an expected objective of the grant as well. Many of the grants were being used to hold open workshops with Partnership representatives on documenting existing work underway in each watershed and explore what the focus of the action agenda should be.

The three agency representatives noted in their interviews that:

- The focus of the effort should be on developing a process for communication and not focus on specific project needs.
- The effort needs to include discussions on how the watershed will work with the Partnership.
- The Partnership is still developing its approach, so the timing is good to bring the watershed groups together so they can help shape what the interaction could look like.
- In addition to the salmon recovery and WRIA planning efforts, there are a number of other planning efforts underway (TMDLs, shellfish) and other groups and governments that will not feel represented by WRIA representatives.
- The small working group approach to develop recommendations for broader public and planning group involvement was a good way to proceed as there are so many different efforts underway in the watershed.
- The discussion should not focus specifically on the role of the HCCC, but on what the process should look like overall.

These background activities provided a foundation of information for Triangle to develop a revised scope of work (updating HCCC's original January 2007 scope of work with Ecology), an interview protocol and list of interviewees.

The objective of the scope of work was to bring together representatives from habitat and water quality planning groups in Hood Canal to explore a process for how the Hood Canal planning community will work together to make decisions and inform the development of the Partnership's Action Agenda. The results were expected to include developing an agreed-upon approach for sharing existing information, establishing shared priorities, identifying gaps (such as clearly identified actions to achieve priorities), and designing a collaborative and efficient approach for interacting with the Partnership.



The Triangle scope of work called for a series of interviews with planning group representatives, a small working group to develop recommendations, one or more opportunities for a public open house to review the recommendations and a follow up meeting of the working group. The small working group approach was intended to bring together up to 15 individuals to develop a recommended approach that would be then circulated to the broader community for discussion, buy-in and improvements to the approach.

The outcomes resulting from conducting the assessment and preparing for and facilitating the watershed meeting led to a revised set of deliverables and grant outcomes described below.

II. Assessment of Planning Groups in Hood Canal

Based on the list of contacts identified in the background review, Triangle conducted an interview-based assessment of existing habitat and water planning groups to identify their interests and concerns for an integrated approach to working in a collaborative manner with the Partnership. An interview approach was developed including background information overview and questions to guide the interview (see Attachment #1 for a copy of the interview protocol).

From mid-November through early December 2007, Triangle conducted 18 in-person and telephone interviews with representatives from existing planning groups and governments (see Attachment #2 for interviewees and other individuals contacted). Interviewees were identified by representatives of the HCCC, the Ecology, and the Partnership. Additional interviewees were also identified by asking interviewees who should be informed or involved.

After the interviews were completed, Triangle:

- Developed draft interview summary that was reviewed with HCCC and circulated to interviewees;
- Updated the assessment findings based on feedback from interviewees (see Attachment 3 for a copy of the final assessment findings);
- Used assessment findings to craft draft meeting agenda including working with Partnership staff to provide up to date presentations on the Partnership's Action Agenda; and
- Worked with HCCC to refine the project approach including Triangle attendance at Partnership activities occurring in Hood Canal prior to the workshop meeting.

In summary, there were a number of common themes that emerged from the interviews:

1. A small working group is needed to develop recommendations on a Hood Canal wide approach to integrated planning and interacting with the Puget Sound Partnership. It would be hard to develop recommendations with a large group

and there are many individuals that work with several groups.

2. Opportunities to achieve integration at this point in time include political interest in cleaning up Puget Sound through the Puget Sound Partnership and the existence of broad-based technical resources and well established outreach efforts throughout the watershed.
 - a. Working effectively with the Puget Sound Partnership is in the best interest of Hood Canal and must include a clear understanding of roles and the establishment of a broad-based strategy for the recovery of Hood Canal.
 - b. A wide range of water quality/quantity and habitat issues need to be addressed through an integrated approach. The issues stated in the interviews correspond well with the objectives of the Puget Sound Partnership.
 - c. If successful, the integration effort in Hood Canal would be a science-based, whole watershed approach that operates based on an area-wide strategy with broad-based acceptance. Successful integration would result in a functioning ecosystem.
3. Obstacles to integration included damaged natural systems with ongoing detrimental activities, lack of political will to make the tough decisions, differing in the Hood Canal boundaries such as the new “Hood Canal Action Area” as set by the Puget Sound Partnership and meetings for “meetings sake.”
4. Tools and methods recommended for an integration effort include a wide range of ideas for establishing effective communications and agreements, and utilizing current technology for effective information sharing strategies.
 - a. Existing organizational structures that may provide a model for a Hood Canal integration effort include Hood Canal and Nisqually watershed-based organizations and larger processes such as the Lead Entity effort, WRIA planning units and salmon recovery planning.
 - b. Lessons learned from other regional planning efforts include beginning with an area-wide strategy and consensus-based process where all parties are able to participate in an equitable manner.
 - c. There is currently a well-organized watershed-wide approach to developing and funding habitat projects through the Hood Canal Lead Entity. There are multiple efforts to address water quality in Hood Canal, but no established coordinating or communication links between them. This is also true for water quantity, although the scale of the WRIA processes for water quantity may be appropriate.

Based on the interview themes, Triangle recommended that the HCCC convene a small working group of 10 -15 individuals to develop recommendations for integrating watershed planning actions in Hood Canal. During the interviews, Triangle outlined an approach for this small working group, to be convened to

recommend approaches for watershed integration. To gain broad planning group and public input, the small working group recommendations would then be communicated back to Hood Canal planning groups, local and tribal governments, and then presented at one or more open houses for discussion and input from the broader Hood Canal planning community. Interviewees were asked to comment on whether this would be an effective approach. This approach met with approval from all but a few of the interviewees who were opposed to additional meetings in general.



Based upon input received during the interviews, Triangle recommended a short list of individuals that would be invited by HCCC to participate in an initial working group. The intention was to gather a group that could provide the perspective of his or her jurisdiction, planning group and/or issue area and represent more than one organization. Each of these individuals was identified as a person able to represent his or her group or government and keep their constituency informed; help create a recommended process for integrating watershed protection and restoration efforts; and be available for the working group meetings.

In addition to the working group, a number of individuals were recommended as resources to the working group members. Resource agencies and organizations recommended by the interviewees included Ecology, WSU extension, WA Sea Grant, the Hood Canal Watershed Education Network, the Environmental Protection Agency, HCCC, the US Forest Service, Department of Natural Resources, Washington State Parks, and the US Navy. Triangle contacted each agency or organization to locate and invite the appropriate person from each organization or agency.

III. Contractor Conducted Preparations for Working Group Meeting

As the meeting agenda and preparations progressed, the status and abilities of the Partnership as an agency evolved and changed. In effort to track and understand the agencies evolving approach, Triangle conducted regular communications with Partnership representatives and staff. Triangle also attended the Strait of Juan de Fuca Action Area Workshop and the West Sound Watersheds Action Agenda Summit. This helped to develop the draft agenda content for the Hood Canal Watershed Integration meeting including presentations from Partnership representatives.

As other nearby Action Areas were developing more forum style meetings with large number of attendees, some in Hood Canal began to question why Hood Canal was not taking this same approach. This was perhaps a misunderstanding that the grant funding did not have to be applied using the same approach in each watershed. Regardless, interest in the meeting went beyond what the small group approach had originally intended to produce and Triangle began to plan for a larger forum style meeting. The working group approach with resource attendees would be applied depending on the number of attendees now expected to be over 40.

IV. Contractor Facilitated a Watershed Integration Meeting

On January 31, 2008, Betsy Daniels of Triangle Associates facilitated a larger forum style meeting with 45 representatives of Hood Canal planning groups, resource agencies, and local and tribal governments. The objectives of this expanded session were to discuss what a Hood Canal-wide effort should look like to coordinate/integrate habitat, salmon recovery, water quality and quantity planning for the health of the Hood Canal Watershed and for efficient and effective relations with the Puget Sound Partnership (see Attachment 4: Integration Meeting Summary).

Representatives from the Puget Sound Partnership's Leadership Council, Ecosystem Coordination Board, and staff attended the meeting and provided an overview of how the Puget Sound Action Agenda would be developed. These presentations sparked an in-depth dialogue with attendees on what the Partnership would be able to provide to each Action Area in terms of funding or information with regard to how to organize and communicate with the Partnership. The Partnership representatives and staff clarified that while there may be project funding in the future, there was no funding or standard format that would provide for how Action Areas and the Partnership would communicate or work together. This was left up to each Action Area to determine. Several participants expressed that they found it would be difficult to determine how Hood Canal would be organized when there were several components of the Partnership's approach that were still under development, including how project funding would be made available.

Due to significant interest and attendance in the discussion topics, the discussion format for the remaining meeting was changed to a larger general discussion with small group breakout sessions. Resource and planning group members were not separated in the discussions, but worked together on each of the breakout questions.

Each small group discussed the integration/coordination needs in Hood Canal and developed recommendations for addressing this need. Following this small group discussion, one member of each small group presented their findings to the larger group. The results of these discussions fell into the following themes:

Cooperation/integration Needs Identified

- Consensus-building and priority setting across domains (water quality, toxics, etc.)
- Standardized data collection methods and protocols.
- Avoiding duplication of monitoring and recovery efforts.
- Educating the public about the importance of recovering Puget Sound by articulating key Hood Canal recovery issues to stakeholders, the Partnership and public.
- Working together will result in stronger political clout and political support.
- Sharing resources and information on recovery efforts.
- Funding projects that address priorities, and avoiding competition for resources.
- Collectively and proactively recommending changes to the Partnership.
- Maintaining and tracking overall recovery efforts and plans.
- Coordinating interaction and communication with federal and state agencies.

2. Recommendations and options for addressing the coordination/integration needs

Tracking mechanisms:

- Establish Hood Canal-wide report card linked to the Partnership's report card to gauge progress
- Build on the Coordinating Council's tracking database currently under development.



Coordination models:

- Establish an umbrella organization of policy makers. Develop small issue-specific sub-groups to examine specific issues and problems (similar to how low dissolved oxygen is organized and focused).
- Organize what is currently in place – don't create a new organizational layer.
- Research the Chesapeake Bay Recovery Partnership and other models for examples of organizational structures and lessons learned.
- Assign a point person to monitor issues, coordinate groups and check for duplication of efforts.
- Organize to implement the Hood Canal Summer Chum Recovery Plan and then determine what else is needed.
- Develop an organizational structure that holds agencies accountable for implementing recovery plans and that could continue on if the Partnership fails.

Public information and outreach actions:

- Launch an effective public relations campaign to inform and involve the public.
 - o Emphasize the economic importance of the health of Hood Canal.
 - o Present at small community groups.
 - o Develop a shared, coordinated and inspirational message to the public convincing them that Hood Canal is an important resource.
- Develop focus groups on prevention, recovery, science, public relations, and education.
- Adopt a “global warming” level campaign focused on long-term needs.
- Develop a web-based data storage system for information sharing.
- Consider ways to involve local businesses in recovery and outreach efforts.

3. Requests for more information

- » Explanation of Puget Sound Partnership authorities, resources available to Action Areas for projects, and the intended financial structure for the Partnership.
- » Updated organizational chart of the Partnership.

V. HCCC Revised the Expected Deliverables Associated with the Project

Following the Watershed Integration Meeting, Triangle continued to follow Partnership activities in order to consider recommendations for HCCC on how to proceed with the scope of work now that a larger forum meeting had replaced the original approach. This included speaking with Partnership representatives and attending the Hood Canal Action Area Status and Threats Workshop in Port Hadlock on March 5th, 2008. At this time the Partnership was planning several Action Area and Topic Area workshops in the Hood Canal and surrounding Action Areas.

With the Partnership's action agenda currently under construction and "Topic Area" meetings being scheduled by the Partnership, Triangle recommended that open houses and a second meeting to further develop a structure for coordination in Hood Canal would only compete with these efforts. During the Integration Meeting it was clear that Partnership activities including Action Area and Topic Workshops held in Hood Canal and Puget Sound, were viewed as the main drivers for watershed planning integration and coordination at this time.

On March 27th, 2008 Triangle met with the HCCC Board Chair Dave Herrera, Executive Director Jay Watson and Salmon Recovery Program Manager Scott Brewer to discuss how HCCC was interested in proceeding based on the discussions that took place at the Integration Meeting and in light of expected Partnership activities in the near future.

The HCCC Chair explained that his experience at the meeting led to his conclusion that the HCCC is in the best position to serve as a policy body interacting with the Partnership. The HCCC would propose to convene sub-groups by topic area as needed to respond to the inventory and Action Agenda. To build on this approach and gather feedback, the Chair would work directly with the planning groups in attendance at the meeting.

In summary the HCCC decided to:

- Conduct a Board retreat to revisit the 2006 Board Retreat outcomes and consider the HCCC mission.
- Conduct a series of outreach meetings with planning groups to discuss HCCC's proposed approach for working with the Puget Sound Partnership.
- Meet with David Dicks and Dan O'Neal at the May HCCC meeting to discuss this approach
- These outcomes would then be reported to Ecology within the final report for the grant.

VI. HCCC Reviewed and Considered its Mission

At the April 21, 2008 HCCC Board Meeting, members discussed the need to develop a new mission for the HCCC - one that is more reflective of an overarching approach encompassing all aspects of Hood Canal. It was agreed that the mission of the HCCC should also be to develop a relationship with the Partnership and provide services for the Hood Canal watershed that reflect the goals and objectives of the Partnership. As Executive Director Jay Watson had announced his resignation, the Board also discussed how a new Executive Director could fit with in an expanded or changed mission for the organization.

At the May 21, 2008 HCCC Board meeting, the Board Chair and Interim Executive Director presented a discussion paper about the mission and work plan of the organization. This paper was intended to spark discussion about coordination with Partnership and services the organization could provide in the watershed. This paper provided the Board with an overview of the organization's mission and outcomes from the Board's 2006 retreat on regional governance. The Board also discussed the role of HCCC with David Dick's Executive Director of the Puget Sound Partnership. During the discussion the HCCC Board explained that "the HCCC is the forum that can facilitate the setting of priorities and direct funding of projects and actions in Hood Canal consistent with the Action Area Agenda."²

VII. HCCC Outreach to Planning Groups in Hood Canal

Over the 2008 summer months, Board Chairman Dave Herrera conducted outreach efforts to Board members and Planning Groups in Hood Canal about achieving the vision laid out in the May 21st discussion paper and to David Dicks at the May meeting including integration of habitat and water resources activities through the HCCC as the policy body interacting with the Partnership. At each meeting Herrera discussed the HCCC's interest in:

- serving as the policy body interacting with the Partnership;
- convening small groups or workshops on specific topic areas as needed to increase coordination, share information and promote integration; and
- serve a funding and project prioritization coordinator to work toward goals in the Action Area Agenda once completed.

The Board Chair and HCCC staff met with the WRIA 16 and 17 planning units, the Hood Canal Watershed Education Network, the Lower Hood Canal Environmental Coalition, and the Puget Sound Partnership's Ecosystem Coordination Board.

As a result of these discussions reaffirmed previous discussions and results as reported above. These discussions also pointed out the desire for accountability

² Meeting Summary, Hood Canal Coordinating Council, Board of Director's Regular Meeting, Little Creek Casino and Resort, Shelton WA, May 21, 2008.

and monitoring of actions and programs relative to program objectives and missions. A common theme was that the HCCC should provide the coordinating function to track progress and assist groups and individuals in pursuing the goals and objectives towards the protection and restoration of the Hood Canal watershed.

Conclusions

Although this project did not proceed as originally designed by HCCC and Triangle, this effort did serve as an important launching point for the Puget Sound Partnership's communications with the full range of planning efforts currently underway in Hood Canal and for the Hood Canal Coordinating Council to reconsider its mission, role in the watershed and role relative to the Puget Sound Partnership functions and processes.

Ecology's Restoration and Protection grant funding provided the Hood Canal watershed planning community with an opportunity to come together at a critical time to discuss what integration and coordination should look like and how the watershed should interact with the Puget Sound Partnership to help implement integration. The completed assessment and discussion at the Integration Meeting highlighted this watershed's commitment to working with the Partnership in order to boost the activities of existing organizations. The existing organizations see the Partnership as an opportunity to accomplish what they have already documented in existing watershed, recovery and other resource plans. In addition, the acknowledged need for a policy body to interact with the Partnership has inspired the HCCC to reconsider its mission and services it provides in the watershed.

The HCCC Board Chair's outreach and discussion with groups throughout Hood Canal has affirmed HCCC's proposal to serve as the policy body coordinating with the Partnership and as a convener of small groups as needed to organize implementation of the Action Agenda. It is expected that this new role will be led by the HCCC Board and implemented by the HCCC's new Executive Director once appointed.

For More Information

Scott Brewer

Hood Canal Coordinating Council
17791 Fjord Drive NE, Ste. 130, Poulsbo, WA 98370
Phone: (360) 531-0575, **Email:** sbrewer@hccc.wa.gov
Website: www.hccc.wa.gov

Betsy Daniels

Triangle Associates, Inc.
811 1st Ave, Ste. 255, Seattle, WA 98104
Phone: (206) 583-0655, **Email:** bdaniels@triangleassociates.com
Website: www.triangleassociates.com

Attachment #1

HCCC Watershed Integration Interview Guide

Integration of Hood Canal Watershed Protection and Restoration Efforts Interview Guide November, 2007

BACKGROUND

The Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) is undertaking a project to support initial steps toward integrating actions associated with habitat and water quality plans in the Hood Canal watershed. The goal of this effort is to develop a common set of priorities and explore how local planning groups and governments might work together to make decisions and inform the development of the Hood Canal chapter of the Puget Sound Partnership's Action Agenda.

The Council has retained Triangle Associates to facilitate a discussion among representatives of habitat and water quality planning groups, local governments and Indian tribes in the HCCC geographic area. This effort may include developing an agreed-upon approach for sharing existing information, establishing shared priorities, identifying gaps (such as clearly identified actions to achieve priorities), and designing a collaborative and efficient approach for interacting with the Partnership.

Triangle Associates is conducting interviews as part of an assessment of existing planning groups and governments, to identify benefits and challenges, opportunities and obstacles for an integrated approach. The results of these interviews will inform the structure and content of the integration discussions that will follow in a smaller working group setting, to make the process more efficient and manageable.

QUESTIONS

The interview questions are provided below, to give interviewees the opportunity for advance reflection. Written responses are not expected. Interviews will take place either in person or via telephone, and are expected to take between 30–45 minutes. It is important to note that the interviews are confidential. This means that while Triangle Associates will prepare a list of interviewees and a summary of key themes that emerged during the interviews, no names will be associated with any statements in that summary.

Background

1. What organization(s) and/or regional planning group(s) do you represent? What are your title, role and responsibilities?
2. Please describe your experience working on habitat and/or water quality efforts at the watershed level, either within or outside Hood Canal.

Watershed Vision/Issues

3. How would you summarize your overall vision of watershed protection and restoration in Hood Canal that should emerge from this integration effort? How would you describe the opportunities and obstacles to getting there?
4. What do you think are the major Hood Canal-wide issues that need to be addressed in an integration effort? Which of these would you say are currently being addressed adequately and which are not? Why do you think this is the case?
5. What do you think a successful relationship between the Hood Canal Action Area and the Puget Sound Partnership would look like? How will you know that decision-making on habitat and water quality restoration and protection in Hood Canal is integrated and effective?

Lessons Learned

6. Are there lessons learned from your planning group's experience in creating its decision-making and priority-setting processes that would be valuable for this effort?
7. What planning/prioritizing/decision-making/information-sharing tools and methods do you find most effective? Least effective? What examples of effective processes can you recommend that have been used to good effect?
8. Is there an organizational structure you are familiar with that you would recommend as an example of how local planning groups and governments might work together with the Puget Sound Partnership?

Proposed Approach

- Triangle is proposing an approach that begins with convening a small (10–15 person) working group to develop draft recommendations for integrating Hood Canal watershed restoration and recovery efforts. These recommendations would be communicated back to Hood Canal planning groups, local governments and tribal governments, and then presented at one or more open houses for discussion and input from the broader Hood Canal planning community. What needs to be considered to make this approach work?
9. For the working group, what one person would best be able to represent your group or government and keep it informed; help create a recommended process for integrating watershed protection and restoration efforts; and be available for a working group meeting in January and one or more follow-ups in February 2008?
 10. Are there other organizations or individuals you think need to be informed/involved?
 11. What information will your group/government need to effectively participate in the process? Can you recommend resource information that would be helpful?
 12. Do you have any questions for us?

Attachment #2

Hood Canal Watershed Integration Contact Record

	Attachment #2 Individuals and Groups Contacted for the Hood Canal Watershed Integration Project			
	Name	Affiliation	Communication	Outcome
1	Attemann, Rein	People for Puget Sound	Invited to participate as resource	Attended 1st meeting.
2	Babcock, Elizabeth	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association	Invited to participate as resource	Attended 1st meeting.
3	Banigan, Leslie	Kitsap Health District	Referred to us by Keith Grellner	Attend 1st meeting in place of Keith Grellner
4	Barrows, Karen	Jefferson County	Interviewed with Michelle McConnell	Recommended Al Scalf for working group.
5	Bennett-Cumming, Pam	Mason County, WRIA 16	Interviewed at WRIA 16 meeting	Agreed to serve as WRIA 16 placeholder representative.
6	Bolger, Jim	Kitsap County	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Attended 1st meeting.
7	Brewer, Scott	Hood Canal Coordinating Council	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Attended 1st meeting.
8	Brocksmith, Richard	Hood Canal Lead Entity	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Attended 1st meeting.
9	Brown, Kasey	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe		Attended 1st meeting
10	Burbells, Scott	Department of Health	Interviewed	Recommended Bill Dewey for working group.
11	Butler, Ann	Department of Ecology	Interviewed during background phase	Attended 1st meeting.
12	Cambalik, John	Puget Sound Partnership	Interviewed during background phase	Attended 1st meeting.
13	Charnas, Patty	Kitsap County	Contacted for interview, but was on leave	Will serve as back up for Jim Bolger.
14	Chitwood, Scott	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	Invited to participate as resource	Attended 1st meeting.
15	Cook-Tabor, Carrie	US Fish and Wildlife Service	Invited to participate as resource	Attended 1st meeting.
16	Dewey, Bill	Taylor Shellfish	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Attended 1st meeting.
17	Dobey, Emmett	Mason County	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Attended 1st meeting.
18	Dorn, Paul	Suquamish Tribe	Asked to participate in the working group	Was unable to attend the 1st meeting.
19	Dunagan, Chris	Kitsap Sun		Attended 1st meeting.
20	Fagergren, Duane	Puget Sound Partnership	Asked to participate as a resource	Attended 1st meeting.
21	Folkerts, Keith	Kitsap County	Called for interview. Interviewed Jim Bolger in his place.	Did not attend
22	Fuller, Dave	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Attended 1st meeting.
23	Graham, Bill	Jefferson County PUD	Agreed to participate in working group	Attended 1st meeting.
24	Grellner, Keith	Kitsap County Health District	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Unable to attend 1st meeting
25	Hager, Bob	Lower Hood Canal Watershed Coalition	Asked to participate in the working group	Attended 1st meeting.
26	Hannafious	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group		Attended 1st meetnig.

	Name	Affiliation	Communication	Outcome
27	Harrington, Neil	Discovery Bay Shellfish Closure Response	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Attended 1st meeting.
28	Hempelman, Christine	Department of Ecology	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Unable to attend 1st meeting
29	Herrera, Dave	Skokomish Tribe	Unable to schedule interview.	Attended 1st meeting.
30	Jablonski, Ian	City of Port Townsend	Asked to participate in the working group in place of Judy Surber	Attended 1st meeting.
31	Jason Ragan	Taylor Shellfish	Agreed to serve as an alternate for Bill Dewey	Did not attend
32	Jefferson County MRC Group	Jefferson County MRC	Interviewed.	Representative agreed to participate in the working group
33	John Cambalik	Puget Sound Partnership	Represented PSP at the 1st meeting	Attended 1st meeting.
34	Johnson, Phil	Jefferson County Commissioner	Referred us to Michelle McConnell	Attended 1st meeting as an observer.
35	King, Teri	Washington Sea Grant	Interviewed at WRIA 16 meeting	Attended 1st meeting.
36	LaRoche, Gabrielle	Jefferson MRC	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Unable to attend 1st meeting
37	Latham, Al	Conservation District	Asked to participate in the working group	Attended 1st meeting.
38	Longenbaugh, Matt	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association	Asked to participate as a resource	Attended 1st meeting.
39	McColum, Paul	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe	Asked to participate as a working group member.	Attended 1st meeting.
40	Macrow, Paula	North Olympic Salmon Enhancement Group	Interviewed. Did not respond to request to participate in working group.	No longer with NOSC
41	Matchett, Bill	Hood Canal Environmental Council	Referred us to Vern Rutter	Did not attend
42	McKee, Kim	Ecology	Asked to participate in the working group in place of Christine Hempleman	Attended 1st meeting.
43	Metzger, Bob	US Forest Service	Asked to participate as a resource	Did not attend
44	Michelle McConnell	Jefferson County	Interviewed.	Recommended Al Scalf for working group.
45	Morgan, Mark	Kitsap County PUD	Asked to participate in the working group	Attended 1st meeting.
46	Morrill, Doug	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	Asked to participate in the working group	Unable to attend 1st meeting
47	O'Neal, Dan	Puget Sound Partnership	Asked to participate as a resource	Attended 1st meeting.
48	Pearson, Pat	Jefferson MRC	Asked to participate in the working group	Attended 1st meeting.
49	Peterson, Debra	Washington State Parks Department	Asked to participate as a resource	Attended 1st meeting.
50	Peterson, Joel	Jefferson County	Interviewed with Michelle McConnell	Recommended Al Scalf for working group.
51	Petz, Mike	WRIA 16	Interviewed at WRIA 16 meeting and asked to participate in the working group	Attended 1st meeting.
52	Redman, Scott	Puget Sound Partnership	Asked to participate as a resource	Attended 1st meeting and presented information on the PSP

	Name	Affiliation	Communication	Outcome
53	Regan, Chris	Washington State Parks Department	Asked to participate as a resource	Attended 1st meeting.
54	Rutter, Vern	Hood Canal Environmental Council	Referred to us by Bill Matchett and asked to participate in the working group	Attended 1st meeting.
55	Sanford, Emily	WSU/HCWEN	Asked to participate as a resource	Attended 1st meeting.
56	Scalf, Al	Jefferson County	Interviewed.	Agreed to participate in working group
57	Shafer, Becky	Department of Health	Referred us to Scott Burbells	Did not attend
58	Sharar, Mike	ESA Adolfson		Attended 1st meeting.
59	Sheldon, Tim	Mason County Comissioner	Contacted for interivew, Emmet Doby attended as rep.	Did not attend
60	Small, Doris	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Attended 1st meeting.
61	Sullivan, Jeromy	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe	Unable to do interview.	Did not attend
62	Surber, Judy	City of Port Townsend	Interviewed and agreed to participate in working group	Unable to attend 1st meeting. Ian Jablonski attended in her place.
63	Tynan, Tim	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association	Asked to participate as a resource..	Attended 1st meeting.
64	Watson, Jay	Hood Canal Coordinating Council	Asked to participate as a resource	Attended 1st meeting.
65	Weller, Chris	Point No Point Treaty Council		Attended 1st meeting.
66	Werner, Neil	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	Interviewed. Recommended Richard Brocksmith for the working group.	Attended 1st meeting.
67	Whitford, Stuart	Kitsap County Health District	Recommended as back-up contact if Keith Grellner not available.	Attended 1st meeting
68	Wiatrak, Phil	Ecology	Asked to participate in the working group	Attended 1st meeting.
69	WRIA 16 Group	WRIA 16	Interviewed the group.	WRIA Representative chosen and attended 1st meeting.
70	WRIA 17 Group	WRIA 17	Interviewed the group.	WRIA Representative chosen and attended 1st meeting.
71	Yount, George	Admiralty Audubon		Attended 1st meeting.
72	Zabel, Kim	Department of Health	No longer works on Shellfish issues. Referred to Becky Shafer	Interviewed Scott Burbells in her place.

Attachment #3

Final Assessment



MEMO

www.TriangleAssociates.com

DATE: January 29, 2008

TO: Parties interested in the Hood Canal integration discussions

FROM: Betsy Daniels, Triangle Associates

SUBJECT: January 2nd, 2008 Assessment Summary conducted in preparation for the proposed Hood Canal Protection and Restoration Integration working group meeting (see attached).

COMMENTS:

In circulating this summary document over the last month, we have received a excellent questions and have had a number of in-depth discussions about convening an integration discussion in Hood Canal. We wanted to be sure to summarize the general topics and outcomes from these discussions for interested parties.

- The attached summary is part of a larger scope of work sponsored by the Hood Canal Coordinating Council and funded in part by a grant from a 2007 Puget Sound Watershed Protection and Restoration Grant from the WA Department of Ecology.
- The assessment findings were based on 18 interviews (see Summary Attachment 1) and included support for a small working group approach for developing recommendations for a Hood Canal wide approach for coordinating or integrating planning efforts and interacting with the Puget Sound Partnership.
- The first meeting of the working group will be held on January 31st in Port Orchard and is designed as a smaller working group discussion to develop recommendations for how planning efforts and jurisdictions can work together to coordinate and/or integrate their efforts including interacting with the Puget Sound Partnership.
- The working group was convened based on recommendations from the assessment interviewees, the Puget Sound Partnership staff, the Department of Ecology and the Hood Canal Coordinating Council Board and staff. A number of representatives from state and federal resource agencies and organizations in Hood Canal will also attend to respond to questions as needed.
- While the working group does not (and was not designed to) include representation from the full range of organizations, agencies, or efforts underway in Hood Canal, it was intended to bring together a cross-section of representatives from planning efforts and jurisdictions in the watershed. Although represented on planning units, the lead entity or other efforts, the working group list was expanded to include representation from PUD's, Conservation Districts, local environmental interests and others at the request of several participants.
- The assessment findings tended toward a salmon/habitat/water quality discussion; however it was made clear through a number of discussions that water resources/supply must be included in the discussion. The approach



MEMO

www.TriangleAssociates.com

has been revised as a result of these discussions and water resource representatives from 2 PUD's are included on the working group.

- The working group recommendations, for how to work together and for what purpose, will be circulated for review throughout the Canal through existing "listserves" in the watershed and through two or more open houses and brought back in to a meeting in late February to determine next steps.
- The Puget Sound Partnership and the steps for developing a Puget Sound Action Agenda have become much clearer over the course of preparations for the first working group meeting and the agenda for the meeting has evolved to reflect this.

We have been encouraged by the high level of interest in this effort and the enthusiasm for creating a larger table that represents the full range of efforts in Hood Canal. There has also been a great deal of interest in creating something that links up with the Action Area development. I look forward to the discussions over the next several months about how to accomplish this.

Integration of Hood Canal Watershed Protection and Restoration Efforts Assessment Summary January 2, 2008

Background

The Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) is undertaking a project to convene discussions about integrating actions associated with habitat and water quality plans in the Hood Canal watershed. The goal of this effort is to develop a common set of priorities and explore how local planning groups and governments might work together to make decisions, inform the development of the Hood Canal chapter of the Puget Sound Partnership's Action Agenda, and be positioned to capitalize on other opportunities and funding sources.

The Council has retained Triangle Associates to facilitate a discussion among representatives of habitat and water quality planning groups, local governments and Indian tribes in the HCCC geographic area. This effort may include developing an agreed-upon approach for sharing existing information, establishing shared priorities, identifying gaps (such as clearly identified actions to achieve priorities), and designing a watershed-wide collaborative and efficient approach for interacting with the Partnership.

Assessment Process

Triangle Associates conducted 18 in-person and telephone interviews with representatives from existing planning groups and governments from mid-November through early December 2007. The goal was to identify benefits and challenges, opportunities and obstacles for an integrated approach. Interviewees were identified by representatives of the Coordinating Council, the Washington State Department of Ecology, the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP), and by asking interviewees who should be informed or involved. Because the interviews were confidential, no names are associated with statements in this assessment summary. See Attachment 1 for a list of interviewees.

Summary of Findings

In summary, there were a number of common themes that emerged from the interviews (major themes are summarized here with more detail provided in pages 6-11).

1. A small working group is needed to develop recommendations on a Hood Canal wide approach to integrated planning and interacting with the Puget Sound Partnership.

2. A wide range of water quality/quantity and habitat issues need to be addressed through an integrated approach. The issues stated in the interviews correspond well with the objectives of the Puget Sound Partnership.
3. There is currently a well-organized watershed-wide approach to developing and funding habitat projects through the Hood Canal Lead Entity. There are multiple efforts to address water quality in Hood Canal, but no established coordinating or communication links between them. This is also true for water quantity, although the scale of the WRIA processes for water quantity may be appropriate.
4. If successful, the integration effort in Hood Canal would be a science-based, whole watershed approach that operates based on an area-wide strategy with broad-based acceptance. Successful integration would result in a functioning ecosystem.
5. Opportunities to achieve integration at this point in time include political interest in cleaning up Puget Sound through the Puget Sound Partnership and the existence of broad-based technical resources and well established outreach efforts throughout the watershed.
6. Obstacles to integration included damaged natural systems with ongoing detrimental activities, lack of political will to make the tough decisions, differing in the Hood Canal boundaries such as the new “Hood Canal Action Area” as set by the Puget Sound Partnership and meetings for “meetings sake.”
7. Working effectively with the Puget Sound Partnership is in the best interest of Hood Canal and must include a clear understanding of roles and the establishment of a broad-based strategy for the recovery of Hood Canal.
8. Lessons learned from other regional planning efforts include beginning with an area-wide strategy and consensus-based process where all parties are able to participate in an equitable manner.
9. Existing organizational structures that may provide a model for a Hood Canal integration effort include Hood Canal and Nisqually watershed-based organizations and larger processes such as the Lead Entity effort, WRIA planning units and salmon recovery planning.
10. Tools and methods recommended for an integration effort include a wide range of ideas for establishing effective communications and agreements, utilizing current technology for effective information sharing strategies.

Recommendations

Based on these findings, Triangle recommends the following:

A. Establish an Ad Hoc Working Group to Develop Initial Recommendations for Integrating Habitat and Water Quality Actions in Hood Canal.

During the interviews, Triangle proposed a working group for developing recommended approaches for watershed integration. This approach met with approval from most respondents, and Triangle recommends that this working group be convened. The approach begins by convening a small (15–20 person) working group to develop draft recommendations for integrating Hood Canal watershed restoration and recovery efforts. These recommendations would be communicated back to Hood Canal planning groups, local governments and tribal governments, and then presented at one or more open houses for discussion and input from the broader Hood Canal planning community.

Based upon input received during the interviews, Triangle has proposed working group members (See Attachment B) to provide the perspective of his or her jurisdiction, planning group or issue area. Each of these individuals was identified as a person able to represent his or her group or government and keep it informed; help create a recommended process for integrating watershed protection and restoration efforts; and be available for the working group meetings. In some cases, one or more alternate choices have been identified, in case the primary choice is not able to participate. The full list of proposed working group members can be found in Attachment B.

In addition to the working group, a number of individuals will be invited to serve as resources to the working group members. Resource agencies and organizations recommended by the interviewees include Ecology, WSU extension, WA Sea Grant, HCEWC, EPA, HCCC, US Forest Service, DNR, State Parks, and the US Navy. Triangle is currently working with each agency or organization to locate the appropriate invitee from each organization or agency.

This meeting will be open for the public to attend and observe as recommended by a number of interviewees.

B. Focus the working group deliberations on the issue areas identified in the assessment interviews by organizing to achieve the objectives of the Puget Sound Partnership which include:

- a) Protect existing habitat and prevent further losses
- b) Restore habitat functions and values
- c) Significantly reduce toxics entering Puget Sound fresh and marine waters

- d) Significantly reduce nutrients and pathogens entering Puget Sound fresh and marine waters
- e) Improve water quality and habitat by managing storm water runoff
- f) Provide water for people, fish and wildlife, and the environment
- g) Protect ecosystem biodiversity and recover imperiled species
- h) Build and sustain capacity for action

C. Based on the major findings in this assessment, Triangle will develop a draft agenda for consideration by the working group members prior to the first meeting.

The first meeting of this working group will likely be the third or fourth week of January 2008, with a follow-up meeting at the end of February or early March 2008. Agenda topics for the first meeting will likely include:

- A discussion of the purpose, goals and objectives for the working group
- An agreement on the discussion guidelines for the working group
- An overview of the objectives, status and geographic boundaries of existing planning efforts.
- Update on Puget Sound Partnership activities and review of Puget Sound Partnership objectives as an organizing principle for an integration effort.
- Development of recommendations for an integration approach including:
 - purpose
 - goals and objectives
 - decision-making approaches and principles
 - information sharing opportunities and strategies amongst the planning efforts
 - communications with the Puget Sound Partnership
 - representation for an integration effort
- Potential follow-up/HCCC support for implementing the recommendations and/or continuing the working group meetings.

D. In preparation for the first meeting, participants will be asked to compile:

- A summary of the purpose, goals and objectives of the habitat or water quality effort(s) they are representing on the working group.
- A map of the geographic area their planning effort(s) cover within the Hood Canal watershed.
- A description of the existing planning effort(s) that are underway and a bibliography of the products that describe recommended actions or projects.
- The timeframe for their planning effort(s) – how long has it been underway, are there mandated deadlines, and is there a sunset date for the effort?

Major Findings

1. *A small working group is needed to develop recommendations on an approach for how to integrate planning and correspond with the Puget Sound Partnership.*

Although a few interviewees had questions about whether the funding for this effort should be put toward on-the-ground local efforts currently underway, the majority of respondents agreed with the proposed approach of convening a 15-20 person ad-hoc working group to discuss integration of habitat and water quality planning efforts in Hood Canal. There was general agreement that the size of this group would be large enough to be representative, but small enough so that it would not be unwieldy.

2. *A wide range of water quality and habitat issues need to be addressed through an integrated approach and these correspond well with the objectives of the Puget Sound Partnership.*

Interviewees identified a range of issues to be addressed including:

Habitat

- Land use and growth management policies must be put in place and enforced to protect habitat in the face of population and development pressures.
- “Smart growth” and “wiser water” approaches are needed, and attention to be paid to land conversion and forest resources.
- Private property rights must be protected.
- Hood Canal’s few urban areas are very different from the rural areas. Ensure development is both environmentally and aesthetically-appropriate to Hood Canal (i.e. Blackpoint development and the “pit-to-pier” project).
- Address shoreline modifications, freshwater restoration and estuary function, and to protect biodiversity “hot spots.”
- A Hood Canal-wide salmon recovery plan may be needed.

Water Quality/Quantity

- Address toxics and how they affect Hood Canal’s shellfish.
- Low dissolved oxygen must be addressed to recover Hood Canal.
- Water quality is a central issue, and storm water as a major element of it.
- Integration of discussion on water quantity, instream flows, water rights, out-of-basin transfers, water storage and tidal energy.
- Septic and sewer issues are a key concern.

Climate Change

- Climate change is an important overarching issue. Incorporating likely effects of climate change is central to any integration effort.

Treaty Rights

- Uphold treaty rights in the development of plans and priorities.

Communications and Decision-making

- Improve decision-making and coordination, education and outreach, and funding sources/processes/cycles/reporting requirements.

These issues correspond well with the stated objectives of the Puget Sound Partnership (see recommendation B on page 4).

- 3. There is currently a well-organized watershed-wide approach to developing and funding habitat projects through the Hood Canal Lead Entity. There are multiple efforts to address water quality in Hood Canal, but no established coordinating or communication links between them. This is also true for water quantity, although the scale of the WRIA processes for water quantity may be appropriate.***

The Lead Entity process, coordinated in Hood Canal by Richard Brocksmith of the Hood Canal Coordinating Council, was considered a well organized and effective effort for habitat recovery in Hood Canal. The WRIA 16 and 17 planning unit efforts have been successful in completing watershed plans including comprehensive recommendations. WRIA 15 has not completed a plan and the planning unit is no longer meeting. Numerous other water quality efforts are underway, some of which are connected with a single WRIA effort and some are not. There is no one watershed-wide mechanism for water quality communication, coordination or prioritization that parallels the Lead Entity effort for prioritizing and funding habitat projects. This is also true for water quantity, but concerns were raised whether a watershed scale integration effort for water quantity would be effective.

- 4. If successful, the integration effort in Hood Canal would be a science-based, whole watershed approach that operates based on an area-wide strategy with broad-based acceptance. Successful integration would result in a functioning ecosystem.***

When asked to summarize an overall vision of watershed protection and restoration in Hood Canal that should emerge from this integration effort, respondents described natural areas that are healing, sustainable forestry and farming, protected riparian zones, abundant salmon, clean water, and development practices that are in harmony with the Canal's natural areas. Other elements identified include:

- Do what's best for Puget Sound and Hood Canal overall, rather than being proprietary or parochial.
- Have clear policies, leadership, performance standards and funding from the state and national levels, but with recognition that implementation and action must be guided by on-the-ground, citizen-driven efforts.
- Make decisions based on science, not politics.

- Begin with a clear, area-wide strategy incorporating multiple collaborative groups, agreed-upon goals and objectives, and clear tasks, scopes and roles.
- Improve communication at all levels.
- Use adaptive management and monitoring.

5. Opportunities to achieve integration include political interest in cleaning up Puget Sound and the existence of broad-based technical resources and well established outreach efforts.

Respondents identified a number of current opportunities toward reaching this vision, including the fact that the State of Washington has recently launched a high visibility effort to clean up Puget Sound, during a relatively stable state budget environment. The attention being paid to the low dissolved oxygen issue was also seen as an opportunity, as was the fact that several Hood Canal planning processes (such as the WRIAs) have recently released plans that contain specific projects and actions.

Some respondents stated that Hood Canal is fortunate to have good technical people to support planning and implementation efforts. Others felt that outreach and education efforts are resulting in increased awareness and local support for necessary actions. Most saw a need for additional education, to convince people that there is a problem with Puget Sound, and that Hood Canal faces a different set of issues and challenges from the rest of the Sound.

6. Obstacles to integration included damaged natural systems with ongoing detrimental activities, lack of political will to make the tough decisions, frustrating boundaries such as the Hood Canal Action Area and meetings for meetings sake.

Respondents identified the need to overcome 100+ years of activities that have damaged natural systems in Puget Sound and Hood Canal as a major obstacle. Respondents believe many of these poor practices are still occurring. Some respondents perceived a lack of the leadership, political will, trust, communication, coordination, continuity and clarity about roles and responsibilities (for example, in the WRIA planning process) necessary to achieve success. Most saw a lack of adequate and long-term funding as a major obstacle.

Many respondents felt the recently-established Hood Canal Action Area boundary is drawn incorrectly and will cause problems. Some people pointed to hampering bureaucracy and a tendency to have “meetings just to have meetings, plans just to have plans.”

7. Working effectively with the Puget Sound Partnership is in the best interest of Hood Canal and must include a clear understanding of roles and the establishment of a broad-based strategy for the recovery of Hood Canal.

Most respondents see the creation of the Puget Sound Partnership as both an opportunity and a potential obstacle. The opportunity will come from more attention and resources being focused on watershed recovery and restoration. The potential obstacle would

include more layers of bureaucracy that stymie progress (versus local action and control) and/or if the Partnership chooses to impose new structures and solutions from above, rather than building constructively on what is already in place at the local level.

Interviewees noted that it will be of critical importance that Hood Canal establishes an effective relationship with the Partnership, one that both advances the Puget Sound Action Agenda and is in the best interests of Hood Canal habitat and water quality protection and restoration efforts in particular. The most commonly-stated elements of an effective relationship include:

- The Puget Sound Partnership builds on existing successful local planning processes, funnels resources toward Action Area priorities, brings people together for data sharing and technical support, and provides standardization, consistency and direction on Puget Sound-wide issues.
- Hood Canal develops a clear strategy and showing a coordinated front and unified message, perhaps including a Hood Canal “report card.”
- Clear responsibilities and good communication in both directions, a true dialogue. It needs to be clear how decisions are being made that affect the Action Areas.

8. *Lessons learned from other regional planning efforts include beginning with an area-wide strategy and consensus based process where all parties are able to participate in an equitable manner.*

a. *What works?*

- i. Begin by developing a strategy and let that strategy direct plans, projects and priorities, not the other way around. Recognize that it takes time to make good decisions and develop strategy.
- ii. With good facilitation, groups can develop their own best processes, plans and decisions. Define the “box,” leave the rest to the group.
- iii. Consensus processes can encourage ownership, creative approaches, and make implementation more likely.
- iv. Bring land use authorities on board, make the science understandable to elected officials, and get them to sign-off on the land use elements.
- v. Success requires honest communication, public deliberations, representative balance and trust. Everyone’s agendas must be on the table, not hidden. Be transparent.

b. *What to avoid?*

- i. Be careful consensus doesn’t lead to watered-down recommendations or delay decision-making.
- ii. Don’t allow one group the ability to either act unilaterally or exercise veto power.

9. *Existing organizational structures that may provide a model for a Hood Canal integration effort include Hood Canal and Nisqually watershed-based*

organizations and larger processes such as the Lead Entity effort, WRIA planning units and salmon recovery planning.

Interviewees suggested (in order of most common organizations mentioned):

- *Hood Canal Coordinating Council* — The logical place for Hood Canal integration, brings together the elected officials who ultimately have to make decisions. Several interviewees noted that there may be a need to revisit the structure somewhat if this were a model for integration.
- *Lead Entity* — Has successfully implemented many of the elements cited above. Used facilitation and consensus to develop ground rules, expectations, etc. Began with strategy, projects came later.
- *WRIA planning units* — Have assembled the “right people” around the tables, trusting each other, well-facilitated, building consensus.
- *Salmon recovery planning*—Process has been deliberative, iterative, supported.
- *Nisqually Watershed Council* — Has been led very effectively by the Nisqually Tribe, building trust and communication in the watershed.

10. Tools and methods recommended for an integration effort included a wide range of ideas for establishing effective communications and agreements, utilizing current technology and information sharing strategies.

Information sharing tools and technologies

- Make full GIS and other information available to everyone equally.
- Use teleconferencing so people don’t have to travel to meetings.
- Develop online, shared databases of best available science.
- Use performance-based measurement.
- Develop visual and physical models of Hood Canal and Puget Sound, to enhance understanding.

Communication with the Puget Sound Partnership

- Conduct regional briefings for the Action Area representatives before PSP meetings.

Meeting frequency and type

- Produce short, concise summaries to minimize reading.
- Hold an annual regional integration workshop.
- Hold monthly meetings between planning group representatives and decision-makers to report/update, get feedback and lead to decisions.
- Pay citizens/environmental representatives to participate.

Operational structures

- Develop MOUs between groups to formalize and detail responsibilities.
- Establish mission statements, and use strategic plans, benchmarks, and regular reporting.

- Use technical advisory committees and other small groups when the full group is not needed to move forward.

For More Information

Please contact:

Betsy Daniels
Senior Associate
Triangle Associates, Inc
811 First Avenue, Suite 255
Seattle, WA 98104
206-583-0655
bdaniels@triangleassociates.com

Jay Watson
Executive Director
Hood Canal Coordinating Council
17791 Fjord Drive NE, Box HH
Poulsbo, WA 98370-8481
(360) 394-0045
jwatson@hccc.wa.gov

Attachment A: List of Interviewees

NAME	ASSOCIATION
Neil Harrington	Jefferson County, WRIA 17
Al Scalf	Jefferson County
Michelle McConnell	Jefferson County
Karen Barrows	Jefferson County
Joel Peterson	Jefferson County
Emmett Doby	Mason County
Jim Bolger	Kitsap County, WRIA 15
Keith Grellner	Kitsap County Health District
Scott Burbells	Washington State Department of Health
Doris Small, WDFW	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Chris Hempelman	Washington State Department of Ecology
Paula Macrow	North Olympic Salmon Coalition
Neil Werner	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group
Bill Dewey	Taylor Shellfish
Dave Fuller	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
Judy Surber	City of Port Townsend
Scott Brewer	Hood Canal Coordinating Council
Richard Brocksmith	Hood Canal Coordinating Council
<i>members present at 11/15/07 meeting</i>	Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 16
<i>members present at 11/13/07 meeting</i>	Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 17
<i>members present at 12/19/07 meeting</i>	Jefferson MRC

Working Group Participants (as of 1/28/08)

<i>Jurisdictions Attendee</i>		<i>Alternative</i>
Mason County	To be determined	Emmett Doby
Jefferson County	Al Scalf	
Kitsap County	Jim Bolger*	Patty Charnas
Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe	Paul McCollum	David Fuller
Skokomish Tribe	Dave Herrera	
City of Port Townsend	Ian Jablonski	Judy Surber
Suquamish Tribe	Paul Dorn	
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	Scott Chitwood	
Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	Doug Morrill	
<i>WRIA/MRC</i>		
WRIA 15**	Jim Bolger*, Kitsap County	
WRIA 16	Mike Petz	
WRIA 17	Neil Harrington, Jefferson County*	
Jefferson MRC	Pat Pearson, WSU	Gabrielle LaRoche, LaRoche & Associates
<i>Salmon/Habitat</i>		
Regional Recovery Plan	Scott Brewer, HCCC	
Lead Entity	Richard Brocksmith, HCCC	
Conservation District	Al Latham, Jefferson Cons. Dist.	
State Habitat	Doris Small, WDFW	
<i>Water Quality (Shellfish, TMDL)/Water Quantity</i>		
TMDL	Kim McKee, Ecology	
Shellfish Protection District	Neil Harrington*, Jefferson County	
Local Health Authority	Leslie Banigan, Kitsap Health District	Keith Grellner
Private Shellfish	Bill Dewey, Taylor Shellfish	Jason Ragan
Water Resources	Bill Graham, Jefferson County PUD	
Water Resources	Mark Morgan, Kitsap County PUD	
Watershed Planning	Phil Wiatrak, Ecology	
<i>Local Environmental NGO</i>		
Hood Canal Environmental Council	Vern Rutter	

**Representing more than one jurisdiction, organization or interest*

***Refers to WRIA 15 geographic area*

Attachment #4

Hood Canal Watershed Integration Meeting Summary

Meeting Summary
INTEGRATION OF HOOD CANAL WATERSHED PROTECTION AND RESTORATION EFFORTS
Given Center, 1026 Sidney Road, Port Orchard, WA
January 31st 9:00 to 3:30 PM

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of this meeting was to explore the purpose and structure for a Hood Canal-wide coordination/integration effort for habitat, salmon recovery, water quality and quantity planning. The goal of this coordination and integration would be to protect and restore the health of the Hood Canal Watershed and for efficient and effective relations with the Puget Sound Partnership (Partnership).

MEETING FORMAT

This meeting was originally planned as a small working group session with resource attendees and observers. Due to significant attendance and interest in the discussion topics, the format was changed to a larger general discussion with small group breakout sessions. Please see Attachment 1 for a list of meeting participants.

AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Facilitator Betsy Daniels of Triangle Associates, Inc. introduced herself and provided an overview of the activities leading up to the meeting including the Hood Canal Coordinating Council's receipt of a Department of Ecology watershed integration grant. Betsy also reviewed the purpose of the meeting and the agenda for the day.

David Herrera, Skokomish Tribe/HCCC Chair

David Herrera from the Skokomish Tribe gave opening remarks and provided background on the goals of the meeting. He emphasized the importance of communicating Hood Canal recovery issues to the public; relating these recovery issues to the objectives of the Puget Sound Partnership; and ensuring that everyone is included in this effort so that they know they have a place to talk about their recovery efforts.

Dan O'Neal, Puget Sound Partnership

Dan O'Neal of the Puget Sound Partnership Leadership Council introduced himself and provided background on the Partnership. He stated that the Partnership is primarily interested in aligning the interests and activities in Hood Canal with the overall goal of cleaning up Puget Sound. The Partnership is currently working hard to collect information for an Action Agenda inventory which will help the Partnership understand what is being done in Hood Canal and identify gaps. Mr. O'Neal also stressed the importance of public support and participation in the effort to clean up Puget Sound.

Teri King, Puget Sound Partnership Ecosystem Coordination Representative for Hood Canal thanked Dan O'Neal for his comments and expressed appreciation for his efforts on the Puget Sound Partnership Leadership Council. Ms. King explained that the inventory is still in process and is available to answer any questions.

Jay Watson, Executive Director of the Hood Canal Coordinating Council explained that the goals of the watershed integration meetings are to better understand the people and organizations in Hood Canal and examine how best to interact with the Partnership. Mr. Watson stated that all the options are on the table and he hopes the group can decide how best to interact with the Partnership. He explained that the Coordinating Council is serving as a convener and can help carry meetings forward beyond the watershed integration grant if there is interest in continuing.

Statements of Success

Each meeting participant introduced themselves and described what they envisioned as a successful outcome from the working group effort. Some participants focused on the process while others emphasized specific recovery issues. Vision statement themes included:

- Establishing a watershed-wide holistic approach to restoration so that the parties can work together effectively for the overall benefit of Hood Canal;
- Developing a method for prioritizing recovery projects, and ensuring that funding and resources are more efficiently shared across the watershed (reducing or eliminating competition);
- Receiving specific guidance from the Partnership on standards for monitoring and evaluation methods determining success and well as
- Implementing well-coordinated, comprehensive and effective public outreach and education on Hood Canal recovery issues.
- Coordination to address specific recovery issues including a desire to see measurable improvements in salmon recovery, low dissolved oxygen, water quality, soil quality, data monitoring, and critical areas.
- Coordination to address sewer and septic issues including a desire to for a clearer definition of septic and sewer related to the Growth Management Act (GMA).

Puget Sound Partnership Update and Discussion

Scott Redman of the Puget Sound Partnership provided an update on and timeline for the development of the Action Agenda. In Hood Canal, the Partnership has requested agencies and organizations complete an inventory intended as a comprehensive catalog of the programs in Hood Canal. The status and threats revealed by this information will be discussed at upcoming Action Area workshops.

- **Inventory:** Meeting participants asked clarifying questions regarding this inventory (Note: As of 2/5/08 the due date for the inventory has been extended to February 28th. The Hood Canal Action Area Workshop on status and threats will be March 5th at the Inn at Port Hadlock). Inventory information can be sent directly to Partnership via the web or to Teri King.
- **Ecosystem Coordination Board:** Participants inquired about the role and authority of the ecosystem coordination board representatives. Partnership representatives stated that the ecosystem representatives do not have explicit authority and are designed to serve a communication/liaison function. In some areas, ecosystem representatives have proceeded to build a community of stakeholders and in other areas, they serve a more passive role.
- **Sewers and Septics:** Participants asked if the Partnership would help address specific issues such as pending Growth Management Act hearings board decisions regarding sewers and septic systems. Partnership representatives stated that this year they are primarily focused on completing the Action Agenda and establishing an overall program that people will believe in and support. They are generally not prepared to take on specific issues at this time.
- **Public Outreach:** Participants expressed concern regarding public outreach following the completion of the Action Agenda and stated that the public is not aware of the Action Agenda or the recovery efforts in Hood Canal. The Partnership stated that they are working on putting together a communications effort to get a consistent message to the public regarding the importance of recovering the health of Puget Sound. The Partnership will implement a public outreach plan beginning in late spring or early summer.
- **Guidance to Action Areas:** In response to several questions, Scott Redman and Dan O-Neal clarified that the Partnership has not provided, and does not have any plans to provide, guidance or preferences for how existing efforts should organize or communicate within the seven Action Areas.

Needs and Recommendations for Regional Cooperation/Integration

Due to the large turn out of meeting participants, the working group/resource attendees model originally intended for the meeting was not used. The facilitator established small groups to discuss the integration/coordination need in Hood Canal and develop recommendations for addressing this need. Following this small group discussion, one member of each small group presented their findings to the larger group. The results of these discussions fell into the following themes:

I. Cooperation/integration needs included:

- Consensus-building and priority setting across domains (water quality, toxics, etc.).
- Standardized data collection methods and protocols.
- Avoiding duplication of monitoring and recovery efforts.
- Educating the public about the importance of recovering Puget Sound/Articulating key Hood Canal recovery issues to stakeholders, the Partnership and public.
- Working together for stronger political clout and political support.
- Sharing resources and information on recovery efforts.
- Funding projects that address priorities, and avoiding competition for resources.
- Collectively and proactively recommending changes to the Partnership.
- Maintaining and tracking overall recovery efforts and plans.
- Coordinating interaction and communication with federal and state agencies.

II. Recommendations and options for addressing the coordination/integration needs included:

Tracking mechanisms:

- Establish Hood Canal-wide report card linked to the Partnership's report card to gauge progress
- Build on the Coordinating Council's tracking database currently under development.

Coordination models:

- Establish an umbrella organization of policy makers. Develop small issue-specific sub-groups to examine specific issues and problems (similar to how low dissolved oxygen is organized and focused).
- Organize what is currently in place – don't create a new organizational layer.
- Research the Chesapeake Bay Recovery Partnership and other models for examples of organizational structures and lessons learned.
- Assign a point person to monitor issues, coordinate groups and check for duplication of efforts.
- Organize to implement the Hood Canal Summer Chum Recovery Plan and then determine what else is needed.
- Develop an organizational structure that holds agencies accountable for implementing recovery plans and that could continue on if the Partnership fails.

Public information and outreach actions

- Launch an effective public relations campaign to inform and involve the public.
 - Emphasize the economic importance of the health of Hood Canal.
 - Present at small community groups.
 - Develop a shared, coordinated and inspirational message to the public convincing them that Hood Canal is an important resource.
- Develop focus groups on prevention, recovery, science, public relations, and education.
- Adopt a "global warming" level campaign focused on long-term needs.

- Develop a web-based data storage system for information sharing.
- Consider ways to involve local businesses in recovery and outreach efforts.

III. Requests for more information:

- Explanation of Puget Sound Partnership authorities, resources available to Action Areas for projects, and the intended financial structure for the Partnership.
- Updated organizational chart of the Partnership.

Salmon Recovery Implementation Discussion

Accountability for implementation of salmon recovery plans was brought up as a discussion topic by NOAA resource attendees. Several NOAA representatives asked the group to consider if the Summer Chum Recovery Plan could be used as an organizing principle for a watershed coordination effort. Representatives of the Partnership stated that they are interested in helping to promote implementation of the recovery plans. Partnership representatives explained that the Partnership is committed to ensuring accountability and will develop indicators to convey information to the stakeholders and the public and that the recovery plans will be part of this effort. Dave Herrera from the Skokomish Tribe noted that the Tribes have been heavily involved in implementing salmon recovery plans.

Common Themes

Facilitator Betsy Daniels asked group members to state what key themes/messages they heard from this meeting.

Needs:

- Accountability
- Coordination/communication within the Action Area
- Sharing best practices across the watershed
- Avoiding duplication of research, monitoring, projects.
- Leveraging money for Hood Canal
- Cross-discipline communication
- A common strategy to recover the watershed - to address political constraints
- Track and review implementation of recovery plans

Recommendations

- Implement public outreach and engagement efforts
- Ensure that Action Agenda Area workshops are publically advertized with evening meetings and wide involvement
- Establish a Hood Canal-wide report card to track progress of recovery efforts
- Partnership should serve as the umbrella organization. Ecosystem coordinator reports progress in Hood Canal to the Partnership.
- Implementation of recovery plans should be reviewed by a governing body.

Next Steps

The group discussed whether the next meeting should be associated with the Partnerships Action Area workshop or stand alone. Participants were split on whether the group had determined a need for a coordination / integration effort in Hood Canal.

Betsy Daniels recommended that the options had not been developed enough to present at public open houses as originally planned. Betsy will work with Coordinating Council and Partnership representatives to coordinate and determine the timing of next steps.

Closing Remarks

Dan O'Neal of the Puget Sound Partnership stated that the meeting was useful and explained that the Partnership is not a regulatory agency and they don't anticipate a lot of funding. The Partnership views itself as an overseer of Puget Sound health. He explained the Partnership's role is as a "public nag" for agencies and people running organizations. They look at existing entities and urge the direction of existing funding money in the right direction.

Groups and Individuals to invite at the next meeting

Participants listed the following organizations and individuals to be invited to the next meeting.

Washington Department of Transportation, Megan White
Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development
Mason County Conservation District
US Navy
Business/Industry
Department of Natural Resources

Adjourn

Betsy Daniels thanked the parties for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

Attachment 1: Meeting Participants
Integration of Hood Canal Watershed Protection and Restoration Efforts

Name	Affiliation	Phone	Email	Role
Rein Attemann	People for Puget Sound	(206) 382-7007	rattemann@pugetsound.org	Resource Member
Elizabeth Babcock	NOAA Fisheries	(206) 526-4505	Elizabeth.Babcock@noaa.gov	
Leslie Banigan	Kitsap Health District	(360) 337-5235	banigl@health.co.kitsap.wa.us	Working Group Participant
Jim Bolger	Kitsap County	(360) 337-7165	JBolger@co.kitsap.wa.us	Working Group Participant
Scott Brewer	Hood Canal Coordinating Council	(360) 531-0575	sbrewer@hccc.wa.gov	Working Group Participant
Richard Brocksmit	Hood Canal Coordinating Council	(360) 531-2166	rbrocksmit@hccc.wa.gov	Working Group Participant
Kasey Brown	Port Gamble S'Klallam tribe	(360) 297-6271	kaseyb@pgst.nsn.us	Observer
Ann Bulter	Department of Ecology	(360) 407-7257	Anbu461@ecy.wa.gov	Observer
John Cambalik	Puget Sound Partnership	(360) 582-9132	john.cambalik@psp.wa.gov	Resource Member
Scott Chitwood	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	(360) 683-1109	schitwood@jamestowntribe.org	Working Group Participant
Carrie Cook-Tabor	US Fish and Wildlife Service	(360) 753-9512	carrie_cook-tabor@fws.gov	Resource Member
Betsy Daniels	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	bdaniels@triangleassociates.com	Facilitator
Bill Dewey	Taylor Shellfish	(360) 426-6178	billd@taylorshellfish.com	Working Group Participant
Emmett Doby	Mason County	(360) 427-9670 (ext 253)	EmmettDobey@co.mason.wa.us	Working Group Participant
Chris Dunagan	Kitsap Sun	(360) 792-9207		Media
David Fuller	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe	(360) 297-2646	dfuller@pgst.nsn.us	Working Group Participant

Bill Graham	Jefferson County PUD	(360) 385-5800	bgraham@jeffpud.org	Working Group Participant
Bob Hager	Lower Hood Canal Coalition	(360) 275-0618	bhager@msn.com	Working Group Participant
Dan Hannafious	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement	(360) 275-3575	dan@hcseg.org	
Neil Harrington	Jefferson County/WRIA 17	(360) 385-9411	nharrington@co.jefferson.wa.us	Working Group Participant
Dave Herrera	Skokomish Tribe	(360) 426-4232	davidh@skokomish.org	Working Group Participant
Ian Jablonski	City of Port Townsend	(360) 379-5001	ijablonski@cityofpt.us	Working Group Participant
Phil Johnson	Jefferson County	(360) 385-9100		
Teri King	Washington Sea Grant	(360) 432-3054	guatemala@u.washington.edu	Resource Member
Al Latham	Jefferson Conservation Dist.	(360) 385-4105	al@jeffersoncd.org	Working Group Participant
Matt Longenbaugh	NOAA Fisheries	(360) 753-7761	matthew.longenbaugh@noaa.gov	Resource Member
Paul McCollum	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe	(360) 297-6237	paulm@pgst.nsn.us	Working Group Participant
Kim McKee	Ecology	(360) 407-6566	kmck461@ecy.wa.gov	Working Group Participant
Mark Morgan	Kitsap County PUD	(360) 779-7656	mark@kpud.org	Working Group Participant
Dan O'Neal	Puget Sound Partnership	(360) 275-9411	dan@dandio.com	Resource Member
Pat Pearson	Jefferson MRC	(360) 379-5610	pearsonp@wsu.edu	Working Group Participant
Deborah Peterson	Washington State Parks and Recreation	(360) 902-8632	deb.petersen@parks.wa.gov	Resource Member
Mike Petz	WRIA 16	(360) 877-2345	mikepetz_2000@yahoo.com	Working Group Participant
Scott Redman	Puget Sound Partnership	(360) 725-5448	scott.redman@psp.wa.gov	Resource Member
Chris Regan	Washington State Parks and Recreation	(360) 902-8632	Chris.Regan@parks.wa.gov	Resource Member

Vern Rutter	Hood Canal Environmental Council	(360) 476-4622	vernutter@msn.com	Working Group Participant
Emily Sanford	Hood Canal Watershed Education Network	(360) 427-9670 x 682	elpiper@wsu.edu	Resource Member
Al Scalf	Jefferson County	(360) 379-4450	ascalf@co.jefferson.wa.us	Working Group Participant
Mike Sharar	ESA Adolfson	(360) 878-9682	msharar@esassoc.com	Observer
Doris Small	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife	(360) 895-4756	smalldjs@dfw.wa.gov	Working Group Participant
Renee Stern	Triangle Associates	(206) 583-0655	rstern@triangleassociates.com	Facilitation Support
Tim Tynan	NOAA Fisheries	(360) 753-9579	Tim.Tynan@noaa.gov	Resource Member
Jay Watson	Hood Canal Coordinating Council	(360) 394-0045	jwatson@hccc.wa.gov	Resource Member
Chris Weller	Point No Point Treaty Council	(360)297-6532	cweller@pnptc.org	
Neil Werner	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	(360) 275-0373	neil@hcseg.org	
Phil Wiatrak	Ecology	(360) 407-6652	pwia461@ECY.WA.GOV	Working Group Participant
George Yount	Admiralty Audubon	(360) 385-0456	gyount@olypen.org	Observer

